

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-14 and 16 are present in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 3 and 16 have been amended. Reconsideration in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-4 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over U.S. Patent No. 2,872,516 to Hoffman. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claims 1 and 3 have been amended to clarify that the speaker unit is attached on the outside of the support member, wherein the support member includes an opening for receiving sound generated by the speaker unit and an aperture port for outputting the sound. In this manner, sound outputted through the opening of the support member from the speaker unit causes resonance in the support member, and sound is outputted from the aperture port of the support member. Support for these amendments can be found in the specification at, for example, page 3, line 22 - page 6, line 22 and Figs. 1-3.

As defined in claims 1 and 3, the sound outputted through the opening of the support member from the speaker unit causes resonance in the support member and is outputted from the aperture port of the support member. Thus, the support member functions as an acoustic pipe, and such an acoustic pipe with a small volume can enrich a low tone. Consequently, it is not necessary to make the structure of the speaker-provided mounting table overly large. For example, in a thin-type TV set, such as a PDP (plasma display panel) TV set, use of pipe resonance based on a volume of a leg portion of a speaker-provided mounting table makes it possible to produce an enriched low tone at a low cost.

The Office Action contends that a pedestal as defined in claim 1 corresponds to an upper surface of structure P in Hoffman, a hollow-shaped support member of claim 1 corresponds to a

supporting understructure S in Hoffman, and a speaker unit of claim 1 corresponds to a speaker 44 in Hoffman. It is clear from the Hoffman patent, however, that the speaker 44 is not attached to the outside of the supporting understructure S, and the supporting understructure S does not comprise an opening for receiving sound generated by a speaker, and an aperture port for outputting the sound. Thus, the supporting understructure S does not function as an acoustic pipe. For at least this reason, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of independent claims 1 and 3 is misplaced. With regard to dependent claims 2, 4 and 9, Applicants submit that these claims are allowable at least by virtue of their dependency on an allowable independent claim.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

Claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Hoffman. The Hoffman patent, however, does not provide any suggestion to modify its disclosure in order to correct the deficiencies noted above. As such, Applicants submit that claim 5 is allowable at least by virtue of its dependency on an allowable independent claim. Withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

Claims 6-8, 10-14 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Hoffman in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,710,395 to Wilke. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Office Action contends that Wilke discloses an aperture port 80 that corresponds to the aperture port defined in the claims. The Wilke patent, however, lacks at least the structure wherein a speaker unit is attached on the outside of the support member, wherein the support member comprises an opening for receiving sound generated by the speaker unit, and an aperture port for outputting the sound, whereby the sound outputted through the opening of the support member from the speaker unit causes resonance in the support member and is outputted from the aperture port of the support member. The Wilke patent rather discloses a resonance pipe 70

MAEKAWA et al.
Appl. No. 10/606,350
May 22, 2006

located in a speaker housing 10. A speaker 50 is not attached to the outside of the resonance pipe 70, but rather is attached to the speaker housing 10. As such, the Wilke patent similarly does not correct the deficiencies noted above with regard to Hoffman. For at least this reason, Applicants submit that the rejection of claim 16 is misplaced.

With regard to dependent claims 6-8 and 10-14, Applicants submit that these claims are allowable at least by virtue of their dependency on an allowable independent claim.


Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are patentable over the art of record and that the application is in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that anything further is desirable in order to place the application in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Prompt passage to issuance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.

By: 
Alan M. Kagen
Reg. No. 36,178

AMK:jls
901 North Glebe Road, 11th Floor
Arlington, VA 22203-1808
Telephone: (703) 816-4000
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100